To conclude, there is a strong case for an allusion to Priam in Suetonius' death of Galba. There are two verbal echoes of Virgil's *Aeneid* that do not appear in the other versions. The uniqueness of these evocations combined with an abundance of contextual similarities suggests the allusion's certainty. It is further supported by a possible reminiscence of Virgil's model, the death of Pompey, if we accept that *commilito* was also one of the last words uttered by Pompey in the account of Asinius Pollio. The allusion is especially compelling because it reinforces the theme of *auctoritas*, which was a central part of the tradition on Galba's death. It is undeniable that the emperor's *peripeteia* lent itself to a comparison with Priam and Pompey. However, no writer seems to have developed this connection before Suetonius. The deaths of Priam and Pompey were the final nails in the coffins of Troy and the Republic respectively,[25] both phases of the Roman past whose end brought great instability and strife. In the same way, Suetonius' account of Galba's death symbolically punctuates the end of the Julio-Claudian regime with which the biography begins, and the *Life* ends by mentioning the future dynast Vespasian (*Galb*. 23). Thus Suetonius' allusion makes the same point as Tacitus' remark that Galba's last year was nearly that of the Roman empire (*Hist*. 1.11.3).

*University of Reading* TRISTAN J. POWER
t.j.power@reading.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000754

[25] See Morgan (n. 16), 53–4; on Priam and Troy, cf. R. Heinze, *Vergil's Epic Technique* (London, 1993; first published in German, Leipzig, 1903), 23–4.

# APULEIANA II[1]

***Met.* 2.6.1** *tantum a cautela Pamphiles afui ut etiam ultro gestirem tali magisterio me volens ampla cum mercede tradere*. This sentence is unexceptionable. But is *volens* right? It seems weak and it certainly adds nothing after *ultro*.[2] Reading *volans* gives us a much more forceful picture. And indeed when, a few lines below, he does return to Pamphile's home, he so describes himself, *ad Milonis hospitium perniciter evolo*. Lucius' desire to 'fly' to Pamphile may then have a humorous analogue in the scene where he watches her transform herself into a bird and literally fly away (3.21.6).

**6.8.7** *meas potissimum manus incidisti et inter Orci cancros iam ipsos haesisti*. Nothing resembling a satisfactory explanation of *cancros* has been offered, either by way of exegesis or by way of parallel. But it surely gives us a graphic image. *OLD* takes *cancer* here in the sense of 'barrier', as attested at Paul. Fest. 46.40. This seems very weak, especially with *haesisti*. Those who would promote this view might find a little support at 11.21.6 (*inferum claustra*). *TLL* thinks it alludes to some underworld

[1] See *Apuleiana* in S. Bay (ed.), *Studia Palaeophilologica* (Champaign, 2004), 37–44. I cite Apuleius from D. S. Robertson's three-volume edition of the *Metamorphoses* (Paris, 1940–6).

[2] *Ultro . . . volens* does occur at Seneca, *Phaedra* 441 (*si quis ultro se malis offert volens / seque ipse torquet*), but there it seems suitable and pointed, since the essence of the passage is the distinction between someone who is afflicted by fate and someone who willingly takes on affliction. Note *ultro . . . volens . . . ipse*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000766 Published online by Cambridge University Press

monster, but doesn't identify any such that would suit the noun. Groningen translates, 'You are stuck in the traps of Orcus,' but offers no justification for the translation, instead reviewing all the suggestions previously made.[3] I wonder whether it refers to an instrument of torture, a tongs or pincers used to crush a person's bones.[4] The plural will refer to the arms of the device. Thus, 'you are caught between Orcus' pincers' arms'. I know no such use of the word *cancer*, but its Greek equivalent *καρκίνος* is not only used of tongs, but is also used of tongs as a device of torture.[5] The pincers are then parallel to the earlier *manus*.

**6.9.1** *audaciter in capillos eius inmisa manu trahebat eam nequaquam renitentem*. Context makes it clear that there is more here than a simple description of the violent seizure of one person by another. Psyche has been described in this section of the narrative as a runaway slave (6.7.3 *delitescentem ancillam*; 6.8.2 *fugitivam . . . Veneris ancillam*; 6.8.6 *ancilla nequissima*). Harbouring her will be a crime (6.7.4 *si quis occultationis illicitae crimen subierit*). In other words, this episode is represented with legal language.[6] Thus, we should be prepared to read our sentence as conforming to the legalistic context. *Immissa manu* should be taken as a variation on *iniecta manu*, that is, an allusion to the practice of *manus iniectio*, the laying hold of a person by which a man asserts a legal claim over the other. The use of *immittere* for *inicere* appears to be looseness on Apuleius' part, though we might note that Ulpian himself (*Digest* 11.7.14.1) writes *ad eas* [sc. *res*] *quoque manus mittere oportet* ('that property should also be appropriated'). Even *trahebat* appears to be part of the legal environment. It is a fact that several of our literary mentions of the procedure *manus iniectio* also include the dragging away of the second party, using the verb *traho*.[7] Finally, the seizer here is *consuetudo*, another noun that is used in legal contexts, 'customary practice'. Whether just coincidence or more than that, when Schol. Hor. *Sat*. 1.9.76 describes the practice of *manus iniectio*, he begins by saying, *haec erat consuetudo*.

**8.30.3** *non meae salutis sed simulacri iacentis contemplatione*: 'out of consideration not for my own welfare but for the statue lying on the ground' (Loeb)[8], 'not out of consideration for my well-being, but in view of the image lying there' (Groningen 266).[9] All editors read *iacentis* for the unanimous *tacentis* of the manuscripts.[10]

[3] M. Zimmerman et al., *Apuleius: Metamorphoses Books IV 28–35, V and VI 1–24* (Groningen, 2004), 421–2.

[4] Torture in the underworld is of course commonplace. It includes the use of mechanical devices, e.g. Ixion's wheel; see for several examples Lucian, *Men*. 14.

[5] So Diod. Sic. 20.71.4. Perhaps Eur. *Cyc*. 608–10. Groningen (422), in arguing for 'claws', notes that *cancer* 'is glossed *forceps* once'. Actually, *cancer* is glossed *forceps* several times (e.g. *CGL* 4.31.11, 5.564.2).

[6] Apuleius likes to use legal language. See e.g. 9.27 (end), 9.28 (end). For Apuleius' literary use of juridical conceps, see W. Keulen, 'Some legal themes in Apuleian context', in M. Picone and B. Zimmermann (edd.), *Der Antike Roman und Seine Mittelalterliche Rezeption* (Basel, 1997), 203–29.

[7] See Schol. Hor. *Sat*. 1.9.76; Sen. *Contr*. 2.5.9; Sen. *Apoc*. 13.1. Also, Apuleius himself at *Met*. 9.39.5, 9.42.3.

[8] J. A. Hanson (ed.), *Apuleius: Metamorphoses*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA, 1989).

[9] B. L. Hijmans, Jr., et al., *Apuleius: Metamorphoses Book VIII* (Groningen, 1985).

[10] Prof. Kenney thinks *iacentis* has a special point: 'iacentis reflects the sudden realization that if they do for their beast of burden, they are going to have to carry the damn thing themselves' (*per litt*., 12 Sept. 2005). But they do have at least one slave to carry it.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000766 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Groningen however notes that *tacentis* is not as absurd as usually thought. It might suggest that the priests are reluctant to kill the ass without any verbal direction from the goddess. This I think is probably true, but there is more to say. Roman culture was very familiar with silent goddesses. There is one or more known as *Dea Tacita*.[11] Little is known of Angerona except for her silence.[12] Most important, the Magna Mater herself may have been in some circles a 'silent goddess'. This would not be surprising since the earth, with which she is identified, is considered 'silent', in contrast to the heavens and the seas.[13] Recall Lucretius' famous passage on the Magna Mater, wherein, in the immediate context of conveying the deity's icon, we are told *munificat tacita mortales muta salute* (2.625).[14] The goddess is silent.[15]

Now it happens to be that in the Roman world there was much confusion, conflation, association and identification between the cult of the Dea Syria and that of the Magna Mater (Cybele). Nor is this a surprise since the two religions shared many features. The *Metamorphoses* often reflects both these facts.[16] Thus, the silence of the Magna Mater (and other deities) may have been attributed as well to the Dea Syria and this would be reflected in the words *simulacri tacentis*. We ought to also note that in the great Isis-procession of Book 11 the icon of the great god is described *altioris utcumque et magno silentio tegendae religionis argumentum ineffabile* (11.11).[17]

Thus, there is perhaps a touch of humour here. The goddess remains silent because, after all, she is a 'silent goddess'.

**9.7.4** *nudatus ipse*. I think the commentators have missed the understated joke here that resides in the *ipse*. Groningen is a prime example, 'Presumably the lovers are now dressed.'[18] This is half-right. When the husband unexpectedly returns home (9.5.2), interrupting the lovers *in flagranti*, the wife will have hastily hidden her paramour in the barrel, while quickly dressing herself, and then opening the door. Thus, when the time comes for the lover to make his appearance, he pops out of the barrel stark naked and stays naked while engaging the dimwitted husband in conversation. Following his example, the husband proceeds to strip naked and descend into the barrel. And while the latter is engaged, the lover, already naked, picks up again his erotic activity with the wife.

**9.38.5** *latro . . . invadit avidus.* Translators correctly render *avidus* 'eager' (Loeb) *vel sim*. But there may be more here than meets the eye. The surviving brother pretends that he has been seriously wounded, in order to receive the attacking robber off-guard. Note especially *insperato et longe contra eius opinionem*. The robber is deceived and is pummelled on attacking. Thus, perhaps *avidus* is used here also in its

[11] See e.g. Ovid, *Fasti* 2.572; Plut. *Numa* 86; Lact. *Epit.* 16.

[12] See e.g. Pliny, *HN* 3.65.

[13] See e.g. Statius, *Sil.* 2.251; Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* 144.13.10 (*PL* 37, 1878) *muta terra*.

[14] While allusions to Lucretius do not leap off every page in Apuleius, he had surely read the *DRN* and occasional echoing is present. See especially M. Zimmerman in *Ancient Narrative: Supplementum 5* (Groningen, 2006), 317–39. See too F. Gatscha, *Quaestionum Apuleianarum Capita Tria* (Vienna, 1898), 153.

[15] Perhaps, as Bailey suggests, her silence is (also) related to the fundamental identification/representation of Cybele with the famous black stone of Pessinus.

[16] See Groningen (n. 8), 292–4 for abundant material on all this.

[17] Also with reference to the Isis-cult, *magna religionis . . . silentia* (11.21.7); *probabili taciturnitate* (11.22.1).

[18] B. L. Hijmans, Jr., et al., *Apuleius: Metamorphoses Book IX* (Groningen, 1995), 79.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000766 Published online by Cambridge University Press

pseudo-etymological sense: *avidus a non videndo propter nimiam cupiditatem appellatur; sicut amens qui mentem suam non habet* (Paul. Fest. 23.22). The robber attacks 'blindly', for he is unaware of the reality that awaits him.

**10.30.4** *et inter comas eius aureae pinnulae cognatione simili sociatae prominebant*. Groningen translates, 'Between his locks small golden wings protruded which, because they were exactly alike, became one whole.'[19] Even if we accept Groningen's defence of *cognatio* = *similitudo* (and see *TLL*), which seems dubious and without good parallel, one may doubt that this translation actually reflects the Latin or gives any tolerable sense. Most recent editors emend *cognatione* away, with, for example, *colligatione* (Robertson and Hansen). I would suggest reading instead *collibratione* (*conlibratione*): 'golden wings protruded, joined in a similar (matched) balance'. We have, in other words, a matching pair. *Collibratio* is a rare noun, but that would help explain the corruption. See, for example, Rufinus' translation of Origen, *In Cant*. 2 (*GCS* 33.127). Also, *collibro* at Cato, *Agr.* 19.2; Rufinus (Origen) *In Gen.* 2.6. The use of *libro* with reference to the balancing of wings is quite common, including Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (6.15.5, *libratis pinnarum nutantium molibus*). Also, for example, ps.-Quint. *Decl. Mai.* 13.12 (*libratis alis*).

**10.34.2** *montem illum ligneum terrae vorago decepit*. 'A chasm in the earth opened and swallowed up the wooden mountain.' So Loeb and the other translators. *Decepit* is very difficult. There are examples of *decipere* as essentially the same as the simplex *capere* (*TLL* s.v. 3, col. 178), but none of them justify *decipere* here. Groningen justifies *decepit* as a 'typically Apuleian' etymologizing use.[20] But *accepit* is paleographically simple and is nearly the *mot juste* for ingesting, swallowing.[21] Of the earth 'swallowing' something, see, for example, Pliny, *HN* 18.196; Genesis 4:11. Of water, Virg. *Georg*. 4.362. Also, Pl. *Truc.* 43. See too *TLL* s.v. col. 305; *OLD* 1c.

**11.2.1–3** *regina caeli . . . ista luce feminea conlustrans cuncta moenia et udis ignibus nutriens laeta semina*. The reading *undis* of F and several other manuscripts is reasonably and routinely, though not universally, held to be a scribal slip for *udis*. Most editors print *udis ignibus*, but nobody has successfully defended the 'glaring paradox'.[22] Griffiths follows Blümner's emendation *sudis* ('bright fires') and thinks that the expression is supported by Apuleius' use of the adjective *sudus*. In fact, neither in Apuleius nor anywhere else do we have an example of *sudus* that would justify *sudus ignis*. In general, we ought also to note that no scholar has yet explained how fire nourishes the earth's seeds. What we need to recognize here is that what nourishes the earth's crops is water and so the text here should read *udis imbribus*. The confusion of oblique forms of *ignis* and *imber* is common, for example, Lucr. 1.744, 784, 785; Cat. 62.7; Tib. 1.1.48. The expression *udis imbribus* needs no defence, but we nonetheless note *umidos imbres* at Arnob. *Adv. Nat.* 6.4. Apuleius may be thinking here of dew, which the ancients thought was somehow the product of the moon. Cf. the expression *roscida luna* (Virg. *Georg*. 3.337); also, Sappho 96.12 LP.)

[19] M. Zimmerman, *Apuleius: Metamorphoses Book X* (Groningen, 2000), 370.
[20] Zimmerman (n. 19), 405.
[21] The early scribal conjecture *recepit* also might be right.
[22] J. G. Griffiths, *Apuleius: The Isis-Book* (Leiden, 1975), 119.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000766 Published online by Cambridge University Press

**11.17.3** *nauticis navibusque quae sub imperio mundi nostratis reguntur:* 'sailors and ships under the rule of our world-wide empire' (Loeb). This translation is typical but I think misinterprets the verb. *Rego* here does not refer to the control of the Roman empire, but rather more narrowly refers to the management and guidance of the fleet. See *OLD* s.v. 4a.

**11.19.1** *narratisque meis pro et pristinis aerumnis et praesentibus gaudiis. Pro* makes no sense. Emendations abound. I would suggest *prout* for *pro et. Prout* is virtually correlative with the following *et*, 'both . . . and'. [23]

**11.21.5** *neque vocatus morari nec non iussus festinare*. Apuleius is playing against the cultic polar expression, *vocatus . . . non vocatus* (vel sim), where the reference is to the service the god provides to his devotee. Apuleius turns this around and applies it to the worshiper *vis-à-vis* the god. See, for example, Hor. *Carm*. 2.18.40, *vocatus atque non vocatus*; Thuc. 1.118.3 καὶ παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἄκλητος; Suda 1.83.899.

**11.22.1** *sedulum quod dies obibam culturae sacrorum ministerium. Quod* makes no sense. Most emend to *quot.* This is not entirely satisfactory, requiring the supplying of a verb. For *quod dies* I would suggest reading *quotidie*.

**11.29.4** *et potius exsulta ter futurus quod alii vel semel vix conceditur*. What exactly will Lucius 'be' three times that is hardly ever granted to others even once? I think *futurus* must be defective. Read *facturus*. Lucius will perform the conversion rite three times, that is granted to most others not even once.

**Florida 5** *bono enim studio in theatrum convenistis, ut qui sciatis non locum auctoritatem orationi derogare, sed cum primis hoc spectandum esse, quid in theatro deprehendas*. Apuleius is here playing off a proverb found in both Greek and Latin texts (Otto p. 196): *homo locum ornat, non hominem locus* (Charisius in *Grammatici Latini* [Keil], 1.287, line 15); οὐχ ὁ τόπος τὸν ἄνδρα, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτὸν ἔντιμον ποιεῖ (*Apost.* 13.62). Apuleius inverts, so to speak, the regular form of the proverb. Instead of the usual rejection of the notion that a 'place of honour' can confer honour on a person (or event), Apuleius rejects the idea that a lowly place can bring shame on its 'occupant'.[24]

*University of Illinois, Urbana* HOWARD JACOBSON
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000766

[23] I confess that I am unable to bring a parallel for correlative *prout . . . et* = 'both . . . and'. Nonetheless, given the fact that *ut . . . et* is occasionally used as essentially an equivalent of *et . . . et*, it seems reasonable to assume that *prout . . . et* could have been similarly used. On *ut . . . et* = *et . . . et*, see especially A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus* (Cambridge, 1977), 190, with several examples from Velleius and Seneca.

[24] I am much indebted to Professor E. J. Kenney who read all these notes (and others) and made numerous valuable suggestions and criticisms. I am as well indebted to *CQ*'s anonymous reader who provided substantial help and advice.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000766 Published online by Cambridge University Press